APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,386	01/13/2000	Li-Wen Chen	19608-000230US	8309

30256   7590   03/14/2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P
600 HANSEN WAY
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER
COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	7

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 January 2000_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _2, 3, 6_ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-38 are pending.

Double Patenting

2.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.   Claims 1-37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-37 of copending Application No. 09/483,385 and copending Application No. 09/483,182. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

4.   The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application 09/483,385 and copending application 09/483,182 and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: creating a multi dimensional report from information in a database, receiving a definition of a customer profile, receiving from a user input

indicating a report configuration selection, creating a first dimension table, and creating a fact table.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The co-pending Application '385 claims 1-37 claim a method for performing the steps of creating a multi dimensional report from information in a database and the co-pending Application '182 claims 1-37 claim an apparatus for performing the steps of creating a multi dimensional report from information in a database. The claim limitations in the '385 and '182 co-pending applications are substantially the same as the instant application.

Claim Objections

5.   Claim 4 and 14 objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 4 and 14 recite "creating a customer profiles, and said creating at least one fact table further comprising:". Does Applicant mean "creating a customer profile, and said creating at least one fact table further comprising:" or "creating customer profiles, and said creating at least one fact table further comprising:"? Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,799,286) Morgan et al, hereafter Morgan in view of (US 5,615,109) Eder.

With respect to claims 1 and 11, Morgan teaches, a computer program product (col. 4, lines 7-67, col. 5, lines 1-28, and col. 12, lines 12-30) for creating a multi dimensional report from information in at least one database (col. 1, lines 50-56), said computer program product comprising: code for receiving a definition of at least one customer profile of a plurality of customer profile groups (col. 1, lines 10-28) and code for receiving from a user input indicating a report configuration selection (col. 2, lines 9-16) and a computer readable storage medium for containing codes (col. 4, lines 48-50).

Morgan did not teach, code for creating at least one first dimension table based upon said report configuration selection and said information; code for creating at least one fact table based upon said report configuration selection and said information; and code for providing a report comprised of said at least one first dimension table and said at least one fact table. Code for performing the steps of this claim are inherent to a system that has a computer readable storage medium containing codes. Code is defined as "program instructions. Source code consists of human-readable statements written by a programmer in a programming language. Machine code consists of numerical instructions that the computer can recognize and execute and that were converted from source code.

Eder disclosed, code for creating at least one first dimension table based upon said report configuration selection and said information (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-22); code for creating at least one fact table based upon said report configuration selection and said information (col. 2, lines 24-43); and code for providing a report comprised of said at least one first dimension table and said at least one fact table (col. 12, lines 12-51). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create at least one first dimension table based upon said report configuration selection and said information; creating at least one fact table based upon said report configuration selection and said information; and providing a report comprised of said at least one first dimension table and said at least one fact table and to modify in Morgan because such a modification would allow Morgan to have two tables, a table based upon a report and a table based upon facts. It is well known in a business database environment to have two linking tables with information from a report.

With respect to claims 2 and 12, Morgan teaches, wherein said report is a customer profile report, said information further comprising business performance measures, said code for creating at least one first dimension table (col. 7, lines 40-56, col. 9, lines 1-22, fig. 8 and fig. 18B) further comprising: code for creating a customer profile hierarchy and said creating at least one fact table (col. 5, lines 36-56) further comprising: code for aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy (see fig. 4, steps 80, 82, 84, 92, 100, and 104).

With respect to claims 3 and 13, Morgan teaches, wherein said report is an operation report, said information further comprising business performance measures, said code for creating at least one fact table further comprising: code for aggregating said business performance measures (col. 15, lines 36-49); and code for filtering said customer profiles (col. 15, lines 50-67 and col. 16, lines 36-66).

With respect to claims 4 and 14, Morgan did not teach, wherein said report is a customer behavior report, said information further comprising customer records, said code for creating at least one first dimension table further comprising: code for creating a customer profiles; and said code for creating at least one fact table further comprising: code for aggregating customer records based on said customer profiles.

Eder disclosed, wherein said report is a customer behavior report, said information further comprising customer records, said code for creating at least one first dimension table further comprising: creating a customer profiles; and said code for creating at least one fact table (col. 2, lines 1-23 and lines 60-67) further comprising: code for aggregating customer records based on said customer profiles (col. 3, lines 2-32). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Morgan's report configuration selection with Eder's customer records based on customer profiles because such a combination would allow the fact table to show the profile of the customer and the customer's interest.

With respect to claim 5, Morgan did not teach, further comprising: code for creating a list of customers for each customer profile in said plurality of customer profile

groups; and code for creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group.

Eder disclosed, further comprising: code for creating a list of customers for each customer profile in said plurality of customer profile groups (col. 2, lines 6-62); and code for creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group (col. 13, lines 1-20 –shows a meta model for each customer profile group). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have code for creating a list of customers for each customer profile in said plurality of customer profile groups and code for creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group and to modify in Morgan because such a modification would allow Morgan to create detailed forecasts of sales before generating profit maximizing sets of requisitions.

With respect to claims 6, 15, 24, and 33, Morgan and Eder did not teach, wherein said information comprises telecommunications information, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have telecommunications information and to modify in Morgan and Eder because it would enable Morgan and Eder to have the transmission and reception of information of any type including data and facsimiles using electrical or optical signals sent over wires or fibers through the air.

With respect to claims 7, 15, 25, and 34, Morgan teaches, wherein said information comprises financial information (col. 8, lines 52-67 and col. 9, lines 1-67).

With respect to claims 8, 17, 26, and 35, Morgan did not teach, wherein said information comprises retail marketing information.

Eder disclosed, wherein said information comprises retail marketing information (col. 9, lines 22-38 and col. 12, lines 3-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the information comprise retail marketing information and to modify in Morgan because such a modification would allow Morgan to know the financial condition of the business and individual owner or owners.

With respect to claims 9, 18, 27, and 36, Morgan and Eder did not teach, wherein said information comprises insurance information, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have insurance information and to modify in Morgan and Eder because such a modification would allow Morgan and Eder to know the amount of insurance the business and individual owners of the business have and how much insurance is needed.

With respect to claims 10, 19, 28, and 37, Morgan and Eder did not teach, wherein said information comprises health care information, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have health care information and to modify in Morgan and Eder because such a modification would allow Morgan and Eder to use the health care information as a tracking means to determine if more health care insurance is needed for the organization's employees.

With respect to claim 20, Morgan teaches, A computer program product for transferring information from a first database organized according to a first data model, to a second database, said second database organized according to a second data model to serve as the basis of analysis of the data, said computer program product comprising: code for receiving as input a first data model definition (col. 5, lines 57-64); receiving as input a second data model definition (col. 6, lines 37-67 and col. 7, lines 1-20); code for creating a mapping, said mapping providing a translation for data from said first data model to said second data model (col. 5, lines 64-67 and col. 6, lines 1-13); and code for migrating said data from said first database to said second database according to said mapping (col. 6, lines 14-29).

With respect to claim 21, Morgan teaches, wherein said first data model comprises a star schema (col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, lines 1-7 and lines 32-51).

With respect to claims 22 and 31, Morgan teaches, wherein said second data model comprises an identity centric data organization (col. 8, lines 32-66).

With respect to claims 23 and 32, Morgan teaches, wherein said identity is a customer identity (col. 6, lines 48-52).

With respect to claim 29, Morgan teaches, wherein said second data model comprises a reverse star schema (col. 7, lines 32-55).

With respect to claim 30, Morgan teaches, A computer program product for analyzing information from a database, said database organized according to a first data model, said computer program product comprising: code for receiving as input a definition of a second data model (col. 6, lines 37-67 and col. 7, lines 1-20); code for

creating a mapping from said first data model to said second data model (col. 5, lines 64-67 and col. 6, lines 1-13); and code for analyzing said data base upon said second data model and said mapping (col. 8, lines 32-66).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wiessman et al (6,212,524 B1) disclosed creating and populating a datamart.

Goodes, Byron disclosed data warehousing with a data warehousing server with extremely fast throughput of large volumes of data.

Inquiries

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for Official communications and 703-746-5622 for Unofficial communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1113.

E. Colbert
March 6, 2003

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600